

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Introduction to the special issue : Linguistic and pragmatic outcomes of contact with English

Peterson, Elizabeth

2018-08-01

Peterson , E & Beers Fägersten , K 2018 , ' Introduction to the special issue : Linguistic and pragmatic outcomes of contact with English ' , Journal of Pragmatics , vol. 133 , pp. 105-108 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.06.005>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/239807>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.06.005>

cc_by_nc_nd

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Pragmatics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma

Editorial

Introduction to the special issue: Linguistic and pragmatic outcomes of contact with English



1. Foreign language contact

In the current era, we as linguists have an unprecedented opportunity to explore language contact with a similar set of constraints across multiple languages. The widespread use of English as a source language in settings across the world gives rise to interaction and borrowing from a single language at a scale not previously encountered. An earlier special issue of this journal, titled “The Pragmatics of Borrowing: Investigating the Role of Discourse and Social Context in Language Contact” (Gisle Andersen, Cristiano Furiassi and Biljana Mišić Ilić, eds, 2017), highlighted the need for further research into how contact with English, in its role as a global lingua franca, is or is not distinct from other forms of both historical and contemporary language contact. The particular language contact scenario involving English is generally characterized by being unidirectional, meaning that English influences other languages, but those languages do not influence English, or at least not to the same extent. We refer to this type of language contact as “foreign language contact,” due to the official status of English within most of the language settings explored here. As laid out in Peterson (2017), resorting to official language status is necessitated by the unsatisfactory explanatory strength of terms such as “weak”, “remote”, or “cultural” contact, which do not account for the full complexities of English in its role in the settings we explore.

In this special issue, “Linguistic and Pragmatic Outcomes of Contact with English,” we delve into specific questions raised in the special issue “The Pragmatics of Borrowing,” namely the pragmatic and grammatical incorporation of English-sourced elements in different recipient languages. Our aim is to offer a collection of articles that investigate contact situations with English, accounting for linguistic and pragmatic outcomes from the recipient language perspective, or what Andersen (2017) refers to as *post-hoc* adaptation. The articles in this volume offer research from a number of languages: one Kartvelian language, Georgian; three Indo-European languages, Dutch, Italian, and Spanish; and one planned and/or artificial language (with Indo-European roots), Esperanto. With its global reach and uncommon speech community, Esperanto stands out as a means of testing our claims about how English interacts with territorial languages of nation states.

The articles in this volume contribute to what has been identified as the socio-pragmatic turn in studies of contact with English. Much of the work conducted on English language contact subsequent to the 1980s has focused on what is best classified as lexical borrowing, or in other words accounting for inventories of Anglicisms (for example, the seminal work of Görlach, 2001) in recipient languages. The unifying research aim of the contributors to this special issue is not lexicographic, but rather to bring to center stage the dynamics involved with particular borrowings, usages and innovations. That is, instead of examining the language contact situation with English through a wide-view lens, we focus on particular elements, offering a description of what these forms mean socially and pragmatically, or how they function grammatically. Of equal importance, we aim to analyze everyday language within the receiving community, not specialized vocabulary. Our goal is that the findings presented in this volume can offer a comparative perspective for continued work in this robust area of linguistic research.

2. Something old, something new

As co-editors of this volume, Peterson and Beers Fägersten offer a perspective on recipient languages from the Nordic region of Europe, namely Finnish and Swedish, where English has had a firm presence as an additional language (with foreign language status) for more than three generations. The saliency of English in both societies is, in part, a result of language planning and policy, including the compulsory teaching of English at all levels of primary school, its role in higher education and science, and the promotion of English as the language of both national and international trade and industry (Hult 2012,

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpragma.2018.06.005>

0378-2166/© 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

2017). Playing a much greater role in establishing the presence of English as self-evident in Sweden and Finland (and in other countries as well, according to Furiassi and Zenner et al., this issue) is English-language popular culture. These settings thus exemplify what Preisler (2003) refers to as “English from above” and “English from below”, whereby the former accounts for political or institutional impositions of language policy, and the latter refers to transcultural trends of linguistic appropriation.

In line with traditional views on language contact and borrowing, one phenomenon we encounter is what has been described as cultural borrowing (as per, for example, Myers-Scotton, 2002: 41), one type of direct borrowing or matter replication (see Zenner et al., this issue; see also Matras, 2009), meaning that a linguistic form enters a language along with the phenomenon it describes: that is, a language gains a new term along with a new concept. In many instances, the new form and concept overlap in some ways with an existing heritage form in the recipient language, leading to new opportunities for variation and innovation within the receiving speech community. This type of borrowing relationship is treated in the first articles of this issue.

2.1. *Something borrowed, then localized*

One particularly prominent example of a cultural borrowing trend in Sweden is the use of English swear words. While the use of English in an increasing number of domains has been seen as a threat to the maintenance of Swedish, English swear words represent a counter-example, adding to the native repertoire as opposed to replacing elements within it. Indeed, Beers Fägersten's work on English swearing expressions in Swedish illustrates how the pragmatic functions performed by foreign forms are distinctly different from those performed by heritage forms, or by the borrowed forms within their own native language cultures. A series of investigations indicate that swearing in English indexes a nationally shared, Swedish, non-native English-speaker identity (2012, 2017a). English swear words are standardized and legitimized by their inclusion in the public language of the Swedish media (2014, 2017b), and the new forms resulting from the nativization of English swear words (for example, *fack/fakk* or *fucka* for *fuck*) serve as recurring sources of humor in Swedish discourse (2017b). The appropriation of English swear words is not at the cost of native swear words, but instead these additional words also breathe new life into ‘old’ forms, re-establishing their strength and pragmatic force. This variationist type of relationship with the English-sourced form and heritage forms is nothing short of typical, as seen for example in the articles in this issue.

The issue contains two articles that explore further how contact with English results in new forms assuming a new, localized function. Data from Italian (Furiassi) and Spanish (Balteiro) reveal that the result of contact with English is not simply a matter of lexical borrowing, whereby an English form is integrated wholesale into a recipient language. Instead, contact with English can lead to rather unpredictable outcomes. Common to both of these papers (as well as Zenner et al., this issue) is a focus on construction borrowing, or in this case the borrowing of a phrase, which serves to advance language contact research beyond lexical loanwords by highlighting the new pragmatic functions that novel, contact-induced forms introduce into the recipient languages.

In “*Macaroni English goes pragmatic: False phraseological Anglicisms in Italian as illocutionary acts*,” **Cristiano Furiassi** considers widespread examples of two English-sourced phrases used in Italian discourse: “fly down” and “I know my chickens.” The former phrase is a rebuff akin to “calm down,” while the latter is an assertion of knowing someone (or their nature) well. Citing evidence from newspaper and dictionary corpora, Furiassi shows that these “pseudo-English phrasemes” are more pragmatically salient than their Italian counterparts, *vola basso* and *conosco i miei polli*. However, the fact that these phrases are not used (or used in this way) in native English varieties awards them the status of “macaroni English” and compromises the prestige of English that an Italian speaker may hope to invoke.

Isabel Balteiro's article, “*Oh wait: English pragmatic markers in Spanish football chatspeak*”, also looks at a new, English-sourced form that performs specific pragmatic functions in a receiving language, in this case, Peninsular Spanish. Focusing on the pragmatic discourse marker “oh wait”, Balteiro shows that it is in variation with Spanish forms *espera* or *espera que me he equivocado*, and she gives a full overview of the social and pragmatic meanings of the borrowing. Balteiro's dataset comprises comments on a football chat site, a context in which the computer-mediated, “oralized” but nevertheless written-language medium allows for analysis of particular linguistic and pragmatic outcomes of contact with English. First, Balteiro provides an analysis of orthographical variation (including punctuation) which would otherwise be unobservable in speech. Second, she explores the irony embedded in deliberate usage of “oh wait” as, ostensibly, a pragmatic discourse marker of spontaneous self-repair nevertheless included in mentally-planned discourse.

2.2. *Something old, made new*

Another perspective on this particular language contact phenomenon deals with an innovative or adapted function of previously existing heritage forms, or what has been called “pattern replication” (see Zenner et al. this issue; see also Matras, 2009), for example in the form of loan translations. Because this phenomenon concerns previously existing linguistic matter in the receiving speech community, it be difficult to identify, and, more importantly, to link to influence from English. One way of identifying potential influence from English is to note a spike in an innovative usage concurrent with global cultural movements. Such influence is evident, for example, with the widespread use of quotation strategies involving linguistic elements that match up to English *be like*, a form that has cropped up not only in every native variety of English (D'Arcy, 2017; Tagliamonte, 2016), but in other languages, as well.

For example, in research on the quotative system of Finnish (Peterson and Vaattovaara, 2012) a survey of 416 native speakers of Finnish showed that people under the age of 30 were significantly more likely to use all three of the “new” quotatives *niinku*, *sillee* and *tyyliin*, all of which more or less compare to English *be like*. Furthermore, residents of the capital region of Helsinki were, according to nonparametric tests, more likely to use the relatively more innovative forms *sillee* and *tyyliin*, with less significant results for the older form *niinku*. Tellingly, there were no significant differences in the self-reported use of the Finnish quotative forms between males and females, although both men and women perceived the forms as being “female.” This finding is in line with D’Arcy (2017), who reported that forms of *like*, including the quotative *be like*, are associated with young females, although in fact they are used across age groups and genders.

All of these forms have existed previously in Finnish, but they are now used, in addition to their previous functions, to express quotation. While it may seem straightforward to cite influence from English on quotative forms (and other instances of pattern replication), such claims must be weighed carefully. The relationship between language internal and external factors in any contact situation, including contact with English, is rarely straightforward, as demonstrated by Levey et al. (2013) (who looked at similar quotative forms in Canadian French). Indeed, one of the challenges contact linguists in this area face is devising demonstrable and reliable means of linking language innovations to external causes. Two articles in this special showcase in a demonstrable fashion the grammatical adaptation of English-sourced linguistic elements.

In the first of these articles, “Most borrowable construction ever! A large-scale approach to contact-induced pragmatic change”, Eline Zenner, Kris Heylen, and Freek Van de Velde draw from a Twitter corpus from the Low Countries (2011–2016) to explore 100,000 examples of the construction “ADJ_{superlative} N ever” in Dutch. The authors propose that the English-sourced bare variant of the construction, e.g., “best X ever,” has influenced not only the Dutch bare construction, e.g., “beste X ooit,” illustrating pattern replication, but also the hybrid form, e.g., “beste X ever”, which is an example of both matter and pattern replication. Significantly, contact with English as viewed through the lens of “ADJ_{superlativ} N ever” is shown to have led to an overall increase during the time period studied in bare variants with *ever* but, to an even greater extent, bare and non-bare variants with *ooit*. However, while there is evidence that the English-sourced *ever*-variant is on a path towards becoming fixed as “best X ever”, the *ooit*-variants display more pragmatic variety, observable in more pronounced variation in the polarity of the accompanying evaluative adjective.

In “Accommodating loan verbs in Georgian: Observations and questions”, Nino Amiridze explores emerging evidence of linguistic outcomes in the nascent contact of English and Georgian. This article features an investigation of a contact situation between English and a Kartvelian language that not only is under-represented in the contact literature, but also traditionally associated with Russian in contact contexts. In examining the preverbal marker *da-*, Amiridze shows parallels between the accommodation of Russian verbs in the historical, early stages of Georgian-Russian language contact and the current and on-going process of accommodation of English loan verbs. This study on English verbs and *da-* provides evidence of a progression in the borrowing process that involves stages of accommodation, with further implications for the general process of verbal borrowing in Georgian.

3. Attitudes of resistance to English

The articles presented thus far all illustrate different linguistic and pragmatic outcomes of contact with English as a foreign language. These outcomes establish that new pragmatic functions resulting from English language contact have been enabled, if not enthusiastically ushered in, by consensus among language users themselves. It has been shown that English-sourced particles, discourse markers, phrases, and constructions are not only actively used but, by extension, implicitly endorsed. The final article of this issue, however, considers the pragmatics of resisting contact with English. In “Linguistic and pragmatic influence of English: Does Esperanto resist it?”, Sabine Fiedler explores the impact of English on Esperanto, a planned (or constructed) language, by focusing on language alternation, i.e., code-switching, as a process that indicates a speaker’s inclination to incorporate other-language material in one’s own language use. Fiedler finds that the use of English and English-sourced forms corresponds to only a limited variety of pragmatic functions, which she attributes to a developed metalinguistic consciousness, linguistic loyalty, and shared community norms among Esperanto speakers. In other words, while contact with English may provide new forms, an absence of any new function that is pragmatically significant and positively valued will result in resistance.

The articles in this special issue further establish the interplay between old and new forms, and these forms interact to give rise to new functions. Using data from genres such as computer-mediated communication, newspapers, dictionaries, and spoken data, the collection of articles in this issue explores several themes: grammatical outcomes, pragmatic borrowing, language attitudes, indexicality, and the success vs failure of English-sourced forms.

The guest editors of this special issue express our sincere gratitude to the contributors to the volume, as well as the reviewers. We thank our colleagues who have offered critical comments on this introduction to the volume. We are also grateful to the *Journal of Pragmatics* special issues editor, Anne Bezuidenhout, who has offered such sensible guidance throughout the editorial process.

References

Andersen, G., 2017. A corpus study of pragmatic adaptation: the case of Anglicism [jobb] in Norwegian. *J. Pragmat.* 113, 127–143.

- Beers Fägersten, K., 2012. Fucking svenska! *Språktidningen* 2012 (4), 54–56.
- Beers Fägersten, K., 2014. The use of English swear words in Swedish media. In: Rathje, M. (Ed.), *Swearing in the Nordic Countries*. Dansk Sprognævn, Copenhagen, pp. 63–82.
- Beers Fägersten, K., 2017a. FUCK CANCER, Fucking Åmål, Aldrig fucka upp: the standardization of fuck in Swedish media. In: Beers Fägersten, K., Stapleton, K. (Eds.), *Advances in Swearing Research: New Contexts and New Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 65–86.
- Beers Fägersten, K., 2017b. English swear words as humor in Swedish comic strips. *J. Pragmat.* 121, 175–187.
- D'Arcy, A., 2017. *Discourse-pragmatic Variation in Context: Eight Hundred Years of like*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Görlach, M. (Ed.), 2001. *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms: a Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen European Languages*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Hult, F.M., 2012. English as a transcultural language in Swedish policy and practice. *Tesol Q.* 46 (2), 230–257.
- Hult, F.M., 2017. More than a lingua franca: functions of English in a globalised educational language policy. *Lang. Cult. Curric.* 30 (3), 265–282.
- Levey, S., Groulx, K., Roy, J., 2013. A variationist perspective on discourse-pragmatic change in a contact setting. *Lang. Var. Change* 25, 225–251.
- Matras, Y., 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Myers-Scotton, C., 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Peterson, E., 2017. The nativization of pragmatic borrowings in remote language contact situations. *J. Pragmat.* 113, 116–126.
- Peterson, E., Vaattovaara, J., 2012. Assigning blame: new forms in Finnish and their association with urban youth language. In: *Presentation at Sociolinguistics Symposium 19, Freie Universität Berlin, August 21–24*.
- Preisler, B., 2003. English in Danish and the Danes' English. *Int. J. Sociol. Lang.* 159, 109–126.
- Tagliamonte, S.A., 2016. *Teen Talk: the Language of Adolescents*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Elizabeth Peterson*
University of Helsinki, Finland

Kristy Beers Fägersten
Södertörn University, Sweden
E-mail address: kristy.beers.fagersten@sh.se

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: elizabeth.peterson@helsinki.fi

Available online 12 June 2018